

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/636,079	08/06/2003	Janet K. Yamamoto	UF-152FWCD2 1433		
	7590 06/29/200 IK LLOYD & SALIW	EXAMINER			
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			CHEN, STACY BROWN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			1648		
			·		
	·		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/636,079	YAMAMOTO, JANET K.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stacy B. Chen	1648	

		Stacy B. Chen	1648	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE RE	PLY FILED <u>25 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI			
1. 🛛 The thi pla a F tim	e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on a application, applicant must timely file one of the follow ces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance be periods:	the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, a tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply n	f Appeal. To avoid aba ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) 🗌	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set fort ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN Th 06.07(f).	ng date of the final reject HE FIRST REPLY WAS F	ion. FILED WITHIN
have bee under 37 set forth i may redu	is of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later ce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amoun shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing o	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
2. 🏻 Th filii a I	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp ng the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of th	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since
AMEND	*************************************	t i tidha data affilian a bata	f	
(a) (b) (c) (d) 4.	ne proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 pplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a n-allowable claim(s). They purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	nsideration and/or search (see No. 19w); tter form for appeal by materially recorresponding number of finally recorresponding number of finally recorresponding number of finally recorresponding number of Non-Corresponding Notice Of Non-Correspond Notice Of Non-Corresponding Notice Of Non-Corresponding Notice	OTE below); educing or simplifying ejected claims. compliant Amendment e, timely filed amendme	the issues for (PTOL-324). ent canceling the
Th Cli Cli Cli AFFIDA	w the new or amended claims would be rejected is professatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: aim(s) allowed: aim(s) objected to: 32,53,54,63 and 109-119. aim(s) rejected: 31,35,36,50,55-58,108,120 and 121. aim(s) withdrawn from consideration: VIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		Notice of Appeal will p	nt he entered
be wa	e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bucause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an sonot earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	avit or other evidence i	s necessary and
en sh 10. 🔲 T	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing tered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar he affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
	ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER he request for reconsideration has been considered bu	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
	lote the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of Item 5.

Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 33, 34, 59-62 and 109 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Continuation of Item 7.

Applicant's amendment filed May 25, 2007 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 31, 32, 35, 36, 50, 53-58, 63 and 108-121 are pending and under examination.

Claims 31, 34, 36, 50, 55-58, 108, 120 and 121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a vaccine composition that induces a protective immune response against two or more subtypes of FIV, comprising an effective amount of an FIV immunogen that minimally includes the FIV envelope glycoprotein, does not reasonably provide enablement for a vaccine comprising FIV peptides, proteins, and partial viruses that do not include the FIV envelope glycoprotein. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims broadly encompass a vaccine composition that induces protection against FIV infection (of multiple subtypes), comprising an amount of any FIV immunogen. The immunogens include synthetic FIV peptides, natural or recombinant FIV proteins, fragments of said proteins, cell-free whole or partial FIV virus, and cells infected with FIV virus. Applicant's specification is enabling for embodiments that encompass the FIV envelope glycoprotein from each of the at least two different FIV subtypes. Embodiments that do not encompass the envelope glycoprotein from each of the at least two different subtypes, are not enabled by the specification.

Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but found unpersuasive. Applicant asserts the Coleman et al. publication (2005) teaches the use of FIV immunogens, including FIV p24 protein (pages 1458-1460, including Table 1 and 2, study groups 2-2 and 2-3). In response to Applicant's assertion, the Office has considered the Coleman et al. reference again, and found that FIV p24 was administered to cats as asserted by Applicant. Table 1 shows that the cats were challenged with FIV subtype A in combination with Ribi/rHuIL-12, and protected against subtype A. Therefore, there are other immunogens from FIV that are capable of inducing a protective immune response against subtype A challenge when administered with an appropriate adjuvant. However, the instant claims require that the composition be capable of inducing a protective immune response against two or more subtypes without adjuvant, or with adjuvants that are not demonstrated as capable of enhancing the immunse response to the degree of protection against FIV challenge. This has not been demonstrated in the specification or in Coleman et al.

With regard to Applicant's assertion that the patents submitted with the amendment dated September 26, 2006 are relevant to the enablement issues raised by the Office, Applicant maintains their position that combinations of env and gag, and gag and pro, have been shown to be protective. Applicant asserts that all of the publications previously submitted show that the use of FIV immunogens other than FIV envelope protein can induce an immunogenic repsonse. Applicant asserts that the Examiner is incorporating a limitation ("protein vaccines") that is not present in Applicant's claims, because most of the claims are not limited to protein vaccines. Applicant asserts that they have provided evidence directely relevant to protein-based vaccines. In repsonse to Applicant's assertions, the claims encompass protein-based vaccines, which the Office referred to as "protein vaccines". The embodiments in the claims, where specified, are protein-based vaccines. The immune response to gene products is not analagous art to the instant invention as a whole. While an "immunogen" may encompass gene products, the instant specification does not appear to have contemplated such embodiments. Thus, the art relating to the protective capabilities of non-env embodiments is not relevant to the instant protein-based constructs.

/Stacy B. Chen/ 6-25-2007 Primary Examiner, TC1600